1. PHOTO-témoin

Pierre-Richard Crocy – Capteur d'énergie atmosphérique
sur mon parcours de travail quotidien, 9 janvier 2026

2. VIDEO-source

emptydark, 7 janvier 2026

They Patented Free Energy in the 1800s — And Left the Evidence...

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IWTz3AI5mv4

3. Atmosphère ?

Le fait qu'il y ait parfois de l'électricité dans l'air ne surprendra personne, mais d'aucuns ne manqueront pas de s'estimer surpris par l'affirmation que son exploitation en amont du XX° siècle a longtemps été effective. Dans quelle mesure et par quels moyens, matériels et sociaux ? Et dans quelles circonstances et contexte leur négligence – un euphémisme, a-t-elle clos le dossier – ou pas.

4. De quoi est-il question ?

Discussion de la position académique, aux limites de l'équilibre avec l'ignorance sincère et le déni du fait que « des brevets d'exploitation de l'énergie atmosphérique ont bien été déposés dans les années 1800, et que des preuves de la réalité de ces brevets existent bien. » [1]

5. Transcription anglaise et commentaires en français

"**They [2] patented free energy in the 1800s and left evidence behind the truth about patents.**

There is a popular narrative circulating on the internet claiming that 19th century inventors patented free energy devices that were suppressed by the oil and coal industries. This narrative points to actual patents filed in patent offices as proof of a massive conspiracy of technological suppression.

The reality is simultaneously more interesting and more honest than this simplistic conspiracy. Yes, patents exist. Yes, they are real and can be consulted in public archives of the USPTO, EPO and other offices. No, they do not describe free energy in the sense of violating fundamental laws of

[1] Source : cf. paragraphe n° 2
[2] Le caractère apparemment évasif de cette affirmation peut se rapporter à des précisions hors de cette vidéo.

thermodynamics. They describe ingenious devices that used existing energy sources in creative ways or that had specific efficiencies for limited applications within established physics.

The confusion arises from three main identifiable sources.

First, the technical language of 19th century patents which use terminology different from modern terminology [3]. Terms such as life force, etheric energy, or radiant power had specific technical meanings in their respective contexts, but sound mystical to modern readers unfamiliar with the history of science.

Second, fundamental misunderstanding of what the first and second laws of thermodynamics actually say versus what popular culture thinks they say. The first law does not prohibit highly efficient devices or capturing ambient energy. It only prohibits creating energy from nothing. The second law does not prohibit converting heat into work. It only prohibits 100% efficient conversion in a continuous cycle. Many real devices are wrongly labeled as violating thermodynamics by people who do not understand these distinctions.

Third, selective interpretation of broad patent claims ignoring technical limitations and detailed specifications in the body of the patent. Patent titles and claims are written as broadly as possible to maximize legal protection. The detailed technical description that follows contains actual limitations, operating specifications, and recognition of energy sources.

Modern readers often read only the title and abstract, conclude free energy (does not exist) [4] **and ignore technical details that explain** (its) **actual operation within conventional physics**.

This road map[5] honestly examines 10 categories of patents frequently cited as proof of free energy, explains what devices actually did based on verifiable physics and original patent documentation, and specifically demonstrates why they did not violate laws of conservation of energy or thermodynamics.

The goal is not to discredit historical inventors who were genuinely talented engineers working with the knowledge and technology available in their time under significant material limitations.

The goal is to establish intellectual honesty about what technology truly was versus exaggerated modern claims that dishonor both inventors and science by fabricating mystery where none exists and ignoring real ingenuity that did exist. (…)”

(Fin de l’extrait choisi)

[3] Cet écart sur le choix des mots résume à merveille le retour synthétique – produit par Maria Avadani-Crocy à lecture de l’introduction, suggérant tant l’existence d’un problème technique à comprendre que la performance académique de la ligne créative choisie pour en parler avec l’intention en filigrane de tranquilliser les gens.
[4] The four words added in parenthesis, may restore what was meant but erased, in this key-sentence.
[5] As the « three main identifiable sources » previously referred to, and further precisions in the full text as well.